

THE CLASSICAL JOURNAL

VOLUME IX

JANUARY 1914

NUMBER 4

Editorial

PROFESSOR SHOREY AND THE THEODORE ROOSEVELT PROFESSORSHIP

As may be known to our readers, an exchange system of lectures was inaugurated between Columbia University and the University of Berlin in the year 1906-7. Under this arrangement a permanent professorship was endowed, with the name of the Theodore Roosevelt Professorship of American History and Institutions, and is filled annually by the Prussian ministry of education, with the approval of the German Emperor, upon the nomination of the trustees of Columbia University.

The first appointment to this professorship was that of John W. Burgess, professor of political science in Columbia University. This appointment was made for the year 1906-7. The appointees from year to year since that time have been: President Arthur T. Hadley, of Yale University; Felix Adler, professor of social and political ethics in Columbia University; President Benjamin Ide Wheeler, of the University of California; Charles A. Smith, professor of English in the University of Virginia; Paul S. Reinsch, professor of political science in the University of Wisconsin, and William M. Sloane, professor of history in Columbia University.

Paul Shorey, professor of Greek in the University of Chicago, is the appointee to the Roosevelt Professorship for the present year, and is engaged to give a course of thirty lectures at Berlin on the subject of "Culture and Democracy in America." These lectures, which must be given in the German language, will probably be repeated in whole or in part in other cities of Germany

during the winter and summer semesters. In addition to the lectures just mentioned, Professor Shorey is conducting during the winter semester at the University of Berlin a seminar in the *De anima* of Aristotle.

Professor Shorey is a familiar figure at the annual meetings of the Classical Association of the Middle West and South, and a frequent and welcome contributor to its programs. His presence will be missed at our next annual meeting; but we have cause for congratulation that, whereas nearly all of the previous appointees to this professorship have been chosen, and naturally, from the departments of political science and history, a man should now be chosen from the classical field, *a quo humani nihil alienum est*, and that the choice should fall upon a man so versatile and a scholar so representative of classical culture as is Professor Shorey.

THE IDEA OF UNIVERSAL PEACE IN THE WORKS OF VIRGIL AND DANTE

BY KENNETH C. M. SILLS
Bowdoin College

Men have dreamed of universal peace long before the dawn of the twentieth century; and Jewish prophets and pagan writers, no less than Christians, have looked forward to the day when war shall cease. Poets and philosophers have been unconsciously forwarding the peace movement for hundreds of years; and when international amity shall be not only an ideal but a fact, to them, as well as to statesmen and philanthropists, will the honor be due.

Captains and conquerors leave a little dust
And Kings a dubious legend of their reign;
The swords of Caesar, they are less than rust;
The poet doth remain.

Although the temptation is always strong to read into the records of past years ideas and motives that may not have had such potent force as we would ascribe to them, it is a fascinating and by no means a fruitless task to trace the evolution of national and even international, ideals, and to consider how concerned have been some of the greatest minds of the past with the solution of what are truly perennial difficulties. Upon such a question as that of international peace, the men of the first and of the fourteenth centuries would look from entirely different angles, because not only political theories but political conditions were so unlike those which prevail today; but after all it is largely in the nonessentials that men differ, and the end to be attained is much the same, however the means have varied. Virgil would not have understood the need for international arbitration, since Rome alone could be for him the mistress of the world. Dante would subordinate the nations to the sway of the Holy Roman Empire, ordained of God to give to the world peace. But it is short-sighted and narrow criticism that would pass by the contributions which these great souls made to the idea

of international peace with a supercilious comment on their limitations. Assuredly it would not be uninteresting to know what conceptions of world-peace were held by these two poets to one of whom we turn instinctively for the best expression of the ideals of the Roman world, and the other of whom sums up in himself the finest thinking of the Middle Ages.

It is hardly more than a platitude to say that Virgil was by nature a lover of peace. His biographers have pictured him as a gentle, lovable man, somewhat frail of health, of a rustic simplicity of mien. Born in 70 B.C., he grew to manhood in those troublous days which preceded the founding of the empire; and he knew at first hand of the horrors of civil strife. In the hundred years from 133 to 31, Italy had seen twelve civil wars and had been drained again and again of her best blood. Abroad there had been rapine and fraud and continual oppression of the provinces; at home there had been the barbarous proscriptions, insecurity of property and of life, and unprecedented bloodshed. In the country, even more than at Rome, the woeful ravage and the awful waste of contest after contest had been felt; and Virgil, like many of his neighbors, had experienced the desolation wrought by military confiscations. The advent of the empire, however, not only meant a respite from civil strife but held out the hope of a universal peace; even in his earliest works the poet believes that Rome is entering on a new and highly auspicious era.

It has often been pointed out that one of the peculiar charms of the *Eclogues* is that they picture the contrast between the happiness of life in the ideal Arcadia of the poet's imagination and the abiding misery and unrest of the actual world. The philosophy of these poems is a retreat from struggle and a shelter from strife in beautiful woods and meadows. Occasionally, as in the first eclogue, there are veiled allusions to contemporary events and to the horrors of the civil wars; now and then, as in the tribute to the conqueror Pollio at the opening of the eighth eclogue, the poet hints of the glories of war. But the tone of the poems as a whole is placid and lovely. The Cynthian god demurred when the poet would sing of kings and battles.

Namque super tibi erunt qui dicere laudes,
Vare, tuas cupiant et tristia condere bella (vi. 6, 7).

"There will be enough poets, O Varus, who would wish to sing thy praises and commemorate wars that are dreadful."

The fondness for quiet and for the repose of Nature, the love of home and of the simpler virtues, are not the only indications which the *Eclogues* afford of Virgil's attitude toward peace; in the wonderful fourth eclogue, he prophesies the return of the Golden Age and the cessation of all war. The subject of the poem is two-fold: the coming of a new era and the birth of a particular child. Upon the child at birth, earth lavishes princely gifts. When he is old enough to read, Nature is to double her bounty; but there will still remain among men a few traces of ancient evil. There will still be wars on earth. Another Argo is again to carry chosen heroes; the great Achilles will go a second time to Troy. But when the child becomes a man, mankind will have learned to accept earth's bounty. There will be no more trading, no more farming; the sheep themselves will be clothed in vari-colored wool. Hard labor will cease; peace and justice will return to man. The boy, now grown to man's estate, will govern a world at peace; all remaining traces of national guilt will be done away; the world will be released from perpetual fear.

Virgil's desire for peace is through the very nature of this poem formulated in general and rather vague terms; and yet the attitude is thoroughly Roman. The new ruler is to govern the world that has been thoroughly pacified: *orbem pacatum*; and in the adjective there is the note of haughty imperialism. There is, to be sure, evidence that Virgil believed that the change was to come gradually; but it was to include not only the abolition of war but the cessation of trade and agriculture. Small wonder is it, then, that the fourth eclogue, beautiful as it is, by no means represents Virgil's final word, nor his best thinking. By it peace was to be superimposed upon an expectant world; mankind was to accept the Golden Age, not to work it out. As men grow older, and know more about human life, they are less and less ready to predict the speedy return of the Golden Age. Like many another youthful poet, Virgil at first contented himself with prophesying peace; but it was not long before he knew that there was something far greater than what has been called his "millennium resplendent with purple and saffron rams."

That the new age of peace which Virgil dreamed of in the *Eclogues* could not be given to the world by Rome unless she were strong and prosperous Virgil was well aware. No nation can be an effective agent for ruling the world unless it shows domestic industry. Virgil shared the imperial ambitions of Augustus. He knew that Rome could not flourish unless Italy was strong and fertile; and therefore he gave seven years of his life to his great national poem on the peaceful art of agriculture. It was a subject appropriate to his genius. "Virgil," wrote Francis Bacon, "got as much glory of eloquence, wit, and learning in the expression of the arts of husbandry as of the heroical acts of Aeneas." And it is because Virgil sees the importance of agriculture for the prosperity of Rome and the importance of peace for the proper pursuit of agriculture that he dwells now and then on the horrors of war. At the close of the first Georgic he expresses his wonder that the powers above did not think it wrong that the best blood of Rome should fatten the land of Emathia and Haemus' broad plains; and in somewhat of the same vein which marks Southey's poem on Blenheim he pictures the Italian farmer, sometime in the distant future, with the curved plow upturning Roman javelins, or striking empty helmets with his heavy rake, and gazing astounded on the gigantic bones that start from their broken sepulchers.

"But what they fought each other for
I could not well make out.
But every body said," quoth he,
"That 'twas a famous victory."

In a strain not unlike this the first Georgic ends. The poet speaks of the heavens complaining that it must regard the triumphs of men in a world where right and wrong are confounded, where wars abound, and where swarm myriad forms of crime, where the plow meets with none of its due honor, where the tiller of the soil is swept off, the land left to weeds, and the hook has its curve straightened into the sword blade; "for the unhallowed fury of Mars rages the wide world through." As the antithesis to this vigorous passage on the ravages of war, near the end of the second Georgic in the famous panegyric on the good fortune of the farmer, Virgil sings the praises of a simple society that delighted in hus-

bandry. "Nay, in days before the Cretan king, before our race in its impiety began to regale itself on slaughtered bullocks, this was the life led on earth by Saturn, monarch of the Golden Age, days when the blast of the trumpet and the hammering of the sword on the stubborn anvil were sounds unknown." And the whole point of the *Georgics* is missed, if it is not seen that Virgil believes that his ideal may really be attained by man; that indeed it had been attained when each Roman citizen cultivated his own land, and that it will be attained again in the future if enough Romans will only return to the farm and content themselves with the blessings of peace.

In the *Eclogues*, the dreamer, full of youthful sentiment, sings of what the world will be when the years have passed away; in the *Georgics*, the poet of Italy pictures the glories of the peaceful art of agriculture and shows how his country may refresh her strength. It remains to be considered how the poet laureate of Rome conceives the mission of the empire to be the promotion of civilization and the imposing of peace upon all the nations of the world.

It is nowadays hardly necessary to point out that the *Aeneid* is more than a heroic poem on war. Indeed much modern criticism goes too far in emphasizing the gentler side of Virgil and in slighting the virility of his genius. But like many other strong minds, both in past ages and today, Virgil's whole nature was on the side of peace. It may be an overstatement to assert that in the *Aeneid* "each hero dies lamented or lamenting"; yet it is certain that Virgil's sympathy goes out again and again to the victims of cruel Mars. Like Addison in the *Campaign*, he would cry,

How can I see the gay, the brave, the young
Fall in the cloud of war and lie unsung?

What reader of the *Aeneid* does not remember young Menoetes, slain by Turnus, the type of the peasant who suffers most in war:

Who hated war (though vainly) when he plied
His native fisher-craft in Lerna's streams
Where from his mean abode he ne'er went forth
To wait at great men's doors, but with his sire
Reaped the scant harvest of a rented glebe;¹

¹I use the translation of T. C. Williams.

or Antores, pierced by a wound meant for another, who lay

Ill-fated! looking upward to the light
And dreaming of dear Argos as he died;

or the boy-prince Pallas on his rustic bier,

. . . . the youthful dead,
Like fairest flower by virgin fingers culled,
Frail violet or hyacinth forlorn,
Of color still undimmed and leaf unmarred;
But from the breast of mother earth no more
Its life doth feed.

Yet this pity for the death of the young and the loss of the brave does not come from one who is weak and effeminate. Like Tennyson, Virgil was fond of depicting the pomp and circumstance of war; he was proud of the martial exploits of his race. But however much he may praise individual valor, in the last six books there are many indications that he believes warfare ought not to be, that war is the impious way of settling disputes. It is the fiery Alecto from hell who stirs up strife between the Rutulians and the Trojans. Aeneas again and again feels the injustice of it all. When he kills the youthful Lausus, he calls him "Unhappy boy!" and groans aloud in pity, as he

Beheld the agonizing lips and brow
So wondrous white in death.

Nor should it be forgotten that the closing lines of the *Aeneid* on the death of Turnus incorporate the inevitable protest of man against the cruelty of war.

ast illi solvuntur frigore membra
Vitaque cum gemitu fugit *indignata* sub umbras.

The failing limbs
Sank cold and helpless; and the vital breath
With moan of wrath to darkness fled away.

Yet it is the fundamental conception of the *Aeneid* that out of the mystery of this injustice and sacrifice is to come the great state that is to give the world civilization and peace. If Virgil sometimes calls war abominable, savage, impious; if he pictures Death-dealing War as ever at the doors of Hell, next to the iron bed of the Furies and near wild-eyed Strife, he does not regard the Roman state as

responsible for employing it in conquests: there is nothing of the note which William Vaughn Moody utters in his "Ode on a Soldier Fallen in the Philippines":

Praise, and never a whispered word but the fight he fought was good,
Never a word that the blood on his sword was his country's own heart blood.

No: Virgil seems to regard war as the necessary means to attain the desired end; nor does he hint that it is soon to cease. But he points out and emphasizes the fact that the mission of Rome is to rule the world in peace. Indeed a new age of justice and of concord among the nations could not help being a favorite ideal of the poet who celebrates the old traditions of the mingling of the Trojan and the Latin tribes. Of this new era Virgil often sings. The speech of Jupiter in the first book of the *Aeneid* promises that in the reign of Augustus

Will the world grow mild: the battle-sound
Will be forgot. . . . The dreadful gates
Whence issued war shall with close jointed steel
Be barred impregnably.

But yet this is to come to pass only after Greece has been conquered, Rome sits supreme over prostrate Argos, and Julius Caesar has bounded his power by the ocean and his fame by the stars. Similarly in the ninth book Apollo praises the first martial exploits of Ascanius only to predict final peace.

Hail to thy maiden prowess, boy! This way
The starward path to dwelling place divine.
O sired of gods and sire of gods to come
All future storms of war by fate ordained
Shall into peace and lawful calm subside
Beneath the offspring of Assaracus.

The lines devoted to the praise of Augustus in the sixth book of the *Aeneid* hold that his great glory is the return of the Golden Age; and Anchises urges Julius Caesar, the greatest of conquerors, to forbear from civil war and practice mercy.

But be thou first, O first in Mercy! thou
Who art of birth Olympian! Fling away
Thy glorious sword, mine offspring and mine heir!

In the famous passage on Marcellus, very few readers recall that the lines describe a brave and impetuous soldier.

O brave right arm invincible! What foe
Had 'scaped his onset in the shock of arms,
Whether on foot he strode, or if he spurred
The hot flanks of his war-horse flecked with foam?

but everyone remembers the tribute to the dead youth,

O bring me lilies! Bring with liberal hand!
Sad purple blossoms let me throw—the shade
Of my own kin to honor, heaping high
My gifts upon his grave! So let me pay
An unavailing vow!

So is it, too, when Virgil looks beyond Rome and beyond Romans. In the beautiful lines which express the deepest spiritual aspirations of the Roman for a future life which somehow and somewhere redresses the wavering scales of human justice, in the bright Elysian fields, faithful warriors who have endured wounds fighting for the fatherland are first and most fittingly mentioned. Then come the holy priests and inspired poets and at the climax of the passage those who exemplify the virtues of peace:

All who found
New arts to make man's life more blest and fair
Yea! here dwell all those dead whose deeds bequeath
Deserved and grateful memory to their kind.

Virgil's vision is distinctly a *pax Romana*. The great genius of the Roman is to conquer and to govern. Like the haughty imperialist that he was, he saw to it that other nations accepted his sway and his ideas. In the lines in which Virgil sums up the characteristics of the Roman race, there is a phrase which is the key to the whole matter: *pacis imponere mores*. The Roman is to impose peace, his peace, on the nations. But the *toga*, and not the *pilum* nor even the eagle is the ultimate symbol: the Roman in his garb of peace is to rule the world. Virgil gives no hint of voluntary federation of nations; the world must be governed by Rome. To him Rome is the most beautiful city, the most beautiful idea in the world.

Scilicet et rerum facta est pulcherrima Roma.
Earth hath not any thing to show more fair.

And Virgil believes that after many a conflict and war, after much mysterious shedding of blood and treasure, the Golden Age will be born anew; wars will cease; and under the firm and righteous sway of Rome, the arts of peace will rise to greater and greater heights.

For a time it seemed as if Virgil's dream for Rome might come true. The empire was extended to cover the greater part of the civilized world: all roads led to Rome. And even after the barbarian hosts had come flooding into Italy, Virgil's idea seemed to survive in the Holy Roman Empire. Then, too, the Christian church through the marvelous instrument of the Papacy was another important factor for the unity of the nations. With both these institutions Dante was much concerned, not only in the *Divine Comedy*, but also and especially in the *De monarchia*, one of the most interesting Latin essays which the Middle Ages afford.

The *De monarchia* is a plea for the necessity of a universal empire which shall be independent of the church. To understand its main points, certain facts about Italy at the opening of the fourteenth century must be recalled. Again, as in the first century before Christ, the land was wet with bloodshed. The two parties of Guelphs and Ghibellines were in constant strife. In 1260, ten thousand dead were left upon the plain of Arbia, and at Campaldino in 1289 there was a similar slaughter. Dante gives the following picture of his war-laden country:

Ah slavish Italy! thou inn of grief
Vessel without a pilot in the storm!
. . . . thy living ones
In thee abide not without war, and one
Relentless gnaws another, ay of those
Whom the same wall and the same moat contains.
Seek, wretched one! Around thy sea-coasts wide,
Then homeward to thy bosom turn, and mark
If any part of thee sweet peace enjoy.

Like Virgil, Dante had hard experience of war. Indeed he had taken part in battle, if we are to credit the words of an apocryphal letter: "At Campaldino I proved myself no novice in arms and at first was filled with dismay, and afterwards with deep exaltation at the varying fortunes of the battle." Whatever Dante has to say, therefore, about peace are not the words of a weak visionary.

Virgil was Dante's favorite poet; and although it is impossible to assert that much of Dante's political theory comes from his literary teacher and guide, it is clear that the study of classical authors and particularly of Virgil would call up glorious visions of the old Roman state and urge him to strive in behalf of the Holy Roman Empire. Even before the poet had given in his lot with the Ghibellines who supported the claims of the emperor against the Guelphs who upheld the temporal sovereignty of the pope, he had asserted that the world was in need of a universal empire in order that it might have universal peace. The *Convivio*, written about the year 1300, contains the following passage:

Since the human mind cannot rest content with possession of limited territory but is stimulated by an everlasting love of glory, it follows of necessity that wars and conflicts will arise between different countries . . . and thus the general happiness is marred. Wherefore, to put an end to wars and to the source of wars, it is necessary that the whole earth . . . should form a monarchy or single empire, and that it should be governed by a single emperor who, as he already possesses all things, and has nothing further to acquire, will compel the various kings to remain content within the boundaries of their several kingdoms, and will preserve peace among them. . . . Thus we see that in a ship, while each of the sailors devotes himself to his own special duty, there is one who superintends their united labors and directs them to a common purpose.

These words, written by Dante only a few years after his exile, reveal his earlier political opinions. As he brooded over the wrongs that drove him forever from his beloved Florence, he became more and more convinced that not only they, but many other ills from which Italy suffered, were due to the inordinate desire of the Papacy for temporal power.

The church of Rome,
Mixing two governments that ill assort,
Hath miss'd her footing, fallen into the mire,
And there herself and burden much defiled.

To Dante's mind this was the reason that the growth of a universal empire was blighted, and the cause of universal peace hindered. Filled with such thoughts, he wrote his Latin treatise *De monarchia* to prove that a universal empire is necessary for the well-being of the world, that it is the birthright of the Roman

people, and that its authority comes, not through the hands of the pope, but directly from God. In many ways the essay is typical of the early fourteenth century; it is mediaeval in style and scholastic in thought. The Latin is straightforward and clear, although it lacks the grace which distinguishes the Latin works of Petrarch and the ease and natural vigor which mark the letters of Erasmus. As in most works of the Middle Ages, Latin writers are quoted side by side with the books of the Bible, and their authority is hardly ever questioned. Dante cites Virgil constantly; he is *divinus poeta noster*; and the *Aeneid* is almost a sacred book. Aristotle's *venerabilis auctoritas* is for the most part regarded as decisive. But curious as the lack of critical discrimination may seem to us, and annoying as the scholastic, hair-splitting logic often becomes, now and then Dante's earnestness and deep convictions burst forth into passages that show the poet of the *Divine Comedy*.

At the very outset in terms that are re-echoed in some of our leading journals today, Dante states his thesis that the highest happiness of man lies in intellectual activity; and that intellectual activity is possible only in times of peace.

Whence it is evident [he writes] that universal peace is the greatest and best means ordained for our beatitude. Hence it is that when of old the glad tidings from heaven sounded in the shepherd's ear, the message was not of riches, nor pleasures, nor honor, nor health, nor strength, nor beauty, but peace. For the song of the heavenly host was: *Gloria in altissimis Deo, et in terra pax hominibus bonae voluntatis*. Moreover, the Savior saluted men with *Pax vobiscum*. And it was fitting that our Lord and Savior should give to us the highest form of salutation.

If universal peace is one of the great ideals to be realized by man, the object of politics is to procure it; and the remainder of the first book is given to prove that a universal monarchy is the best means to produce the desired end. By piling argument on argument and by appealing to analogy after analogy in typical scholastic fashion, Dante endeavors to show that if the world is governed by one monarch, mankind will be on the road to greatest happiness. Families, villages, townships, kingdoms are governed on monarchical principles; and the arrangement of the whole should be the same as the arrangement of the parts. Again, when

the Son of Man came down into the world, it must have been in its most perfect condition; and the whole world then formed under divine Augustus a single empire and there was universal peace.

Furthermore, Dante argues that a universal monarchy will furnish a means of judgment between the princes of equal rank, will promote justice for the common people, and will encourage freedom. In the tenth chapter of the first book he lays down principles that with but few changes could be turned into an argument for international arbitration. He writes:

Wherever there can be litigation, there must be some means of obtaining a judgment. Between any two rulers one of whom is not subject to the other, there can be no reason for dispute either through their own fault or the fault of their subjects. And in such cases there ought to be a court of appeal. Since one cannot settle the case for the other, for like has no authority over like, there ought to be a third person with greater jurisdiction who may settle the case for both through his superior authority. And this third person will either be the emperor, or not. If it is the emperor, the problem is solved; if not, recourse must be had to a third equal in rank who will have no authority to enforce his decision: and then the matter will still be in litigation.

To Dante's mind it was impossible that two quarreling nations should submit their differences to another nation for decision, and that nations should agree to abide by the decrees of an international court. But he saw very clearly that if justice was to flourish among nations as among individuals, there must be some final means of settling international disputes: he would make his emperor himself to constitute a court of arbitration.

One of Dante's leading tenets is that the emperor is to be just and merciful. The whole system of government is to be freed from despotism. The fiery Florentine who placed the souls of tyrants in a pool of seething blood in the *Inferno* would never have advocated tyranny. The emperor, he says in words akin to those that we are fond of bestowing upon our president, is "without doubt to be regarded as the servant of all mankind and subject to such laws as will increase the public welfare." And he adds a phrase that might well be engraved upon the halls of our legislatures: "For if laws are not made for the advantage of those on whom they are binding, they are laws in name only, and not in reality." The emperor or monarch is then not so much the abso-

lute ruler as the wise administrator of the laws, and a man filled with intense affection for the human race. Whether such a man were ever born does not concern Dante in the least; throughout the essay he is dealing with ideals.¹

Nor is it any part of Dante's scheme that nations should lose their national characteristics. If for the sake of peace and union all are to be subordinated to one central authority, they are nevertheless to retain their ancient habits and regulations.

All nations, kingdoms, and countries [he says] have their own special characteristics and need to be regulated by special laws. One mode of life is suited to the Scythians who dwell far away amid the rigors of intolerable cold; another mode of life befits the Garamantes whose habitation is near the equator. And therefore it is to be understood that the monarch is to govern the nations in accordance with those universal laws to which all are subject and by means of general rules and directions to guide them in the way of peace.

Yet if the nations are thus to keep their own characteristics, Dante is no less sure than Virgil that the dominion over the other countries of the world belongs by right and by divine decree to the Roman people; in other words, to the Holy Roman Empire. The second book of the *De monarchia* is occupied with this proposition. To his own satisfaction, and doubtless to that of his contemporaries, Dante shows that the Romans were the noblest of peoples. Aeneas, the founder of the race, came of kingly and divine parentage; and his claims to universality are substantiated on the ground that he had three wives: one, Creusa in Asia; another, Dido, in Africa; and a third, Lavinia, in Europe. Furthermore, the Roman people have been successful rulers; and on that pragmatic ground Dante justifies their sway. To prove that the Romans were the agents for creating a universal monarchy, Dante quotes the great lines from Virgil, beginning: "Excudent alii spirantia mollius aera." Finally he asserts that when Christ suffered death upon the cross, unless his punishment had been valid—that is, inflicted by duly constituted authority—there could have been no redemption. Since Christ was crucified at the hands of the Romans, the Roman authority was founded on

¹The Stanhope Prize Essay for 1878, *The Political Theories of Dante*, by A. E. Haigh, expounds the poet's views on these subjects admirably.

rightful claims. "And now, I take it, it has been sufficiently shown that the Roman people acquired to itself the empire of the world by right." It is in this insistence on the restoration of the Roman empire that Dante's system breaks down. There is no question but that he wished to restore Italy to what he regarded as her rightful place among the nations. That the emperor of his day was a German was to him a minor consideration. Dante, with his intense love for order and his ardent patriotism, may well be excused for dreaming that all the nations of the world should again be grouped in submission under the central authority of Rome and be resting in peace beneath her banners; but such a picture history proved was to be but a baseless fabric of a vision.

Dante's plea for a universal empire is in many ways fanciful and ideal. Yet it was based on a firm conviction that peace is a great blessing, and it was carried out with much intellectual vigor. To many people the poet seems such a stern, uncompromising soul that the gentler side of his work is often overlooked. It may be a surprise to know that in the *Divine Comedy*, *pace* is one of the favorite words, occurring five times only in the *Inferno*, but seventeen times in the *Purgatorio* and fourteen times in the *Paradiso*. It occurs in two of the loveliest lines of the poem,

Evenni dal martiro a questa pace (Par. XV, 148);

and

E la sua volantate e nostra pace (Par. III, 85).

But Dante does not associate the word solely with heaven. His whole theory of politics looked to the giving of peace to the world; and when he felt that the church was hindering the cause of peace and fostering factional strife, he directed his attack against her so successfully that she replied by placing the *De monarchia* on the Index. It is well to recall the bitterness with which the essay was received, because it shows that the strangely reasoned and quaintly argued theories were to the churchmen of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries very live issues.

In the present discussion of arbitration and peace there are doubtless many phases of the subject which Virgil and Dante in their day and generation could not have foreseen. To the Roman who regarded all other races as inferior and to the Florentine

who could only dream afar off of a unified Italy, any sort of co-operation between nations without conquest and force of arms would have been impossible. And yet the ideals of Dante and of Virgil should not be dismissed without the thought that they too were working for peace and for the happiness of mankind. If Virgil believed that he saw in the new empire earnest of the real return of the Golden Age, he may well be pardoned for believing that it was Rome's duty first to give the world the benefits of conquest, and then the blessings of civilization and tranquillity. If Dante was advocating a system in which the ties of country should be merged in zeal for the happiness of humanity, the quaintness of his mediaeval arguments in behalf of the survival of the supremacy of Rome nevertheless conceals much grandeur and nobility. Today the swords of the Caesars are rust; and the Holy Roman Empire is but a name. But men are still dreaming of, and hoping for, the days when

The battle sound
Will be forgot. . . . The dreadful gates
Whence issueth war shall with close jointed steel
Be barred impregnably.

And apparently the conviction is growing stronger every year that, to use Dante's own words, "of all the blessings that are ordained for the use of mankind the best is universal peace."

HUMOR REPEATS ITSELF

BY IRENE NYE

Washburn College, Topeka, Kan.

There was a young man from St. Paul
Who went to a British masked ball.
Their mirth to provoke
He dressed as a joke,
But nobody saw him at all.

From Caesar and Virgil, the high-school student scarcely gets the idea that the Romans were jolly dogs who went around continually chuckling over their own jokes. Yet as one extends his acquaintance to other Latin writers it becomes evident that the above-mentioned young man would have had a different story to tell had his experience been among them. In fact many instances of so-called American humor have close parallels in the literature of Rome.

"A farmer once told Lincoln a whopping big fib about his hay crop. Lincoln, smiling his melancholy smile, drawled: 'I've been cutting hay, too.' 'Good crop?' the farmer asked. 'Fine, very fine,' said Lincoln. 'How many tons?' 'Well, I don't know just how many tons,' said Lincoln, carelessly; 'but my men stacked all they could outdoors and then stored the rest in the barn.'" Quintilian mentions, as one type of the humorous story, those where, as he says, one lie is refuted by another, and illustrates it by the reply of a certain Gabba, who, when someone had said that in Sicily he had bought for a very small sum an eel five feet long, remarked, "That's nothing wonderful; they grow so long there that fishermen use them for ropes." A man once met a friend of his, coming out of the theater after the performance, with the question, "Did you see the show?" "Oh no, I've been playing ball in the orchestra." That's another of Quintilian's stories. A farmer one morning found an automobile lying overturned in the edge of his plowed field and in a spirit of helpfulness called to

the owner who stood by it: "What's the matter? Had an accident?" "Oh no, I've just got a new car and have brought my old one out here to bury it. Could you lend me a spade? I can't dig very well with my auto horn." In spite of the twentieth-century elaboration we recognize the old motif. If you, seeing a very small boy with a very large basket, call out facetiously, "Where's that basket going with that boy?" you're repeating a type of joke as old as Cicero at least. For Macrobius has recorded that Cicero once seeing his son-in-law, Lentulus Dolabella, a very short man, girded with a long sword, asked: "Who has tied my son-in-law to that sword?" The lady who was preparing for her first trip abroad and, anxious to exhibit the erudition and culture which she especially lacked, asked in a tone of judicial consideration, "Do you say the Rhine or the Rhone? I've heard it pronounced both ways," has her counterpart in Trimalchio, the delicious invention of Petronius Arbiter. Lest his guests should assume from his being a freedman that his early education had been neglected, Trimalchio undertakes in an offhand way to display his knowledge of Homer and tells the story of the Trojan War: "Diomedes and Ganymedes were two brothers, whose sister was Helen. Agamemnon carried her off and surreptitiously substituted a hind in her place for Diana. So the Trojans and Tarentines fought together, but Agamemnon conquered, and married his daughter Iphigenia to Achilles, which drove Ajax mad, as you shall presently see." The Roman who remarked about a slave famous for his successful thieving, that he was the only slave at his house from whom he did not need to seal or lock up anything, has something in common with the New England farmer, who recommended a laborer in the following words: "This man has worked for me one day and I am satisfied." The American public today smiles over the "nonsense rhyme."

He'd scarcely laid his fortune by,
When the stupid fellow must up and die.

"Who's that lady with you, sir?"
"She's my wife." "By Jupiter,
I knew she must be kin to you,
You look so much alike, you two."

Alas why stayed he not at the sea-side?
For while he was there, he never once died.

The sorry world is sighing now;
Lagrippe is at the door;
And many folks are dying now
Who never died before.

This last is from Carolyn Wells's *Nonsense Anthology*. The other three are examples given by Cicero of what he calls *subabsurda*. The little ducky who says, "All them names that you call me, you is!" is borrowing an old trick often used by the slaves in the comedies of Plautus, who delighted to turn a man's ammunition against himself. If an angry master shouted at his troublesome slave, "May the Gods destroy you!" an obsequious "After you, sir!" though apparently a soft answer, was not calculated to turn aside wrath. We are all familiar with the boy who delights to be just as impudent as he dares, and insolently to rouse the wrath of his auditor to the highest pitch only to disarm the enemy and save himself by some harmless turn at the end. A very clever illustration of this occurs in the *Miles Gloriosus* of Plautus. One slave, Sceledrus, starts to tell his partner of an adventure, beginning: "This morning when I had gone up on the roof of the house, hunting for our pet monkey" Here the other interrupts him with the annoying comment, "By George, a good example of one darned thing after another!" Too angry to continue his story, Sceledrus exclaims: "Plague take you!" "You, rather, I should say," is the retort of the amused Palaestrio, who after a suitable pause completes the sentence in this harmless way, "should go on and tell the story you began." The following appeared recently in the *Boston Transcript*: "Pharaoh had just received the deputation of Nubian slaves to protest against the new hoisting machinery at the Pyramids. 'It's throwing a lot of our men out of work,' said they. 'Bury the deputation between the paws of the Great Sphinx and pour a libation to Isis,' said the ruler. 'These slaves are opposing Progress.'" Why does this amuse us? Why does it look funny when a tall, thin man walks with a short, fat one? Incongruity is at least part of the secret in each case. Noah using a telephone, Lucretia Borgia invited to a tea party—there is incon-

gruity. When Horace adds an appendix to Homer's story of the interview between the shade of Tiresias and Ulysses, and represents the venerable seer as giving advice which would be appropriate in the mouth of a very business-like and up-to-date Roman contemporary of Horace himself, it shows that he had the same notion of a joke as John Kendrick Bangs. Horace never had a chance to read *The House Boat on the Styx* in Rome, but let us hope that one copy at least has found its way to the *sedes discriptas piorum*.

Not only in the types but in the subject-matter also of our jokes we resemble the Romans. When Horace tells of the bore who insisted on accompanying him as he walked through the Forum in spite of all his polite but desperate efforts to escape, when he refers to the habit musicians have of refusing to play when asked, but of never stopping when unasked, or when he tells of the miser, desperately sick, who still demanded to know the price of his gruel before he would drink it and fell back in despair at the answer—in all these cases and in many others he is plainly within the field of our own humorists. And not Horace alone: the bald-headed man, the fat man or woman, the wearer of false hair or teeth, the borrower who never pays, the shopper who never buys, the glutton, the physician in league with the undertaker, the absent-minded professor, on all these subjects Martial, too, exercised his wit, and in Professor Nixon's excellent translation, his epigrams sound very modern indeed.

Philaenis weeps with just one eye.
Queer, is it not?
You wish to know the reason why?
That's all she's got.

Caecilianus never dines
Without a boar served whole;
Caecilianus always dines
With one congenial soul.

Just give Linus half what he asks as a loan;
Then console
Yourself with the thought that you'd rather lose half
Than the whole.

"Quintus loves Thais." "What Thais is that?"

"Why, Thais the one-eyed, who—" "Who?"

Well, I was aware

She'd lost one of her pair,

But I didn't know he had lost two."

The teeth of Thais look like jet;

Laecania's are white.

The cause you ask? The pallid set

Go out at night.

(The joke here is not quite so subtle in the Latin.)

Charinus, the cause of that head-wrap you wear

Isn't pain at your ear-drums, but pain at your hair.

Laughing at others for peculiarities in pronunciation either natural or affected is a charge to which many of us must plead guilty. The American tourist in England prizes such gems as "It's a riny dy, tody," or references to "'Enry the Heighth," from the lips of cabman or guide. The old gamekeeper who pointed out the nests of the pheasants and said, "There's where the 'ens sit on the heggs," was quite unconscious of the amusement he furnished, but the young lady who comes back from Boston and confesses that she "adoahs the Eastuhn atmospheah" is often pleased with the impression which her pronunciation must make, not realizing that one whose birthright includes the "tempestuous Western r" can never "express a feah" or "explain an idear" in the apparently inconsistent but altogether charming fashion of the New Englander "to the manner born." Catullus celebrated in immortal verse a certain Arrius, who, in order to give his conversation a flavor of Greek culture, had the habit of inserting h's, as one might say, both in and out of season. "Insidias" in his speech was "hinsidias." After his departure for Syria, however, Catullus says, "Our ears had a chance to rest and began to recover from the fear of being distressed by excessive aspiration, when of a sudden back came the horrible news that the Ionian Sea, now since Arrius had crossed it, was no longer Ionian, but Hionian!" Not-at-home stories are generally about women nowadays, but it was not always so. Nasica, it is said, once went to see the poet Ennius. When he inquired for him at the door, the servant-girl informed him that

Ennius was not at home, but Nasica noticed that she said this at the bidding of her master and that the latter was in. A few days afterward when Ennius came to visit Nasica and inquired for him at the door, Nasica shouted down that he was not at home. Then Ennius said, "What is this? Don't I know your voice?" and Nasica replied: "You are an insolent fellow. When I inquired for you, I believed your servant-girl that you were not at home, and you won't even believe me!" Do you happen to know a man, a man perhaps with whom you used to go to school when you were both boys, who now refuses to tell the truth about his age? Cicero knew such a man, by name Vibius Curius, and one day in exasperation said to him: "Then I take it, that when we used to practice declamation together, you had not yet been born." Even more familiar seems his comment on a certain lady who said that she was thirty years old: "It's true, for I've heard her say it now for twenty years." While a man is waiting for his wife to add the finishing touches to her toilet, he very seldom finds it much of a joke. But when he looks back to it afterward, or when he is commenting on the ways of women in general, or especially when it is some other man whose experience is under discussion, it seems to him very funny indeed. Men have loved to dwell on this extremely humorous factor in human life since time immemorial, and the Romans were no more the inventors of that joke than ourselves. "We speak of the man of the hour. Is there also a woman of the hour, I wonder?" "No, it takes her an hour and a half," says a recent magazine. "You know the ways of women; while they are getting ready, while they are starting, it is a year," wrote Terence, a hundred years before Cicero. Still earlier Plautus harped on the same theme: "Surely woman was born from Delay herself," he says. The story of the man who woke up after a good nap and inquired of his wife, "Are you talking again or yet?" suggests the second feminine characteristic beloved of paragraph writers. Juvenal satirizes for the amusement of the Romans the excessive volubility of the blue-stocking. In the community where this woman lives, people no longer, he says, at the time of an eclipse, ring bells and blow trumpets after the time-honored custom, to drive away the hosts of darkness that are overpowering the moon.

For, he says, her flow of conversation, unaided, is sufficient to produce the desired effect.

Two of the extant Roman writers on rhetoric have discussed at some length the various means of securing a humorous effect and the place that humor should play in an orator's speech. Their classification can be illustrated from modern humor quite as satisfactorily as from Latin literature. Cicero (in *De oratore*) makes a general division into the humor that may pervade continuously an entire speech, and brief flashes of sharp wit, like the following: When Philippus, whose public career had not been beyond charge of graft, interrupted the orator Catulus with the rude question: "What are you barking about?" the ready answer was: "Because I see a thief." That the humorous effect may depend either upon the words or upon the subject-matter itself forms the basis for a second classification. The joke may lie *in dicto* or *in re*. A joke *in re* may consist of the telling of an amusing incident (real or fictitious), the humorous characterization or description of an individual, or may be made up of exaggerated imitation of something easily recognized. So-called humorous recitations, where the speaker plays the part of one who is intoxicated, belong in this class. As Cicero says, this kind of humor belongs to the actor rather than to the orator and is to be used by the latter only moderately and with extreme caution. When a Washington lady, socially inclined, asked a congressman, "Is your wife entertaining this winter?" and the ungallant but would-be truthful spouse replied, "Not very," he gave us a modern example of the *in dicto* joke. Cicero gives several illustrations: In a Roman lawsuit, while a witness very short of stature was on the stand, the opposing counsel asked if he might propound a question. The president of the court replied: "Be brief about it." "I shall obey you there," said the lawyer, "and ask"—here he glanced at the little witness whom he desired to question—"only a very short one." As there was, however, among the jurors a man sensitive about his height and not so tall even as the witness, the lawyer's attempted joke did him no good service. When Scipio Africanus in adjusting his garland one day at a banquet was unfortunate enough to break it, his neighbor said, "No wonder it does not fit, *caput enim magnum*

est." The joke that depends on a double meaning in some word or words, if spontaneous, may be exceedingly pointed, as in the story about Philippus, quoted above. It may rise to the very height of whimsical absurdity, as in the famous question put by an English humorist to a man carrying a rabbit: "Excuse me, sir, but is that your own hare or a wig?" But it is especially subject to abuse by the professional makers of jokes and often results in atrocities which need not be illustrated. Cicero suggests a test by which one may decide whether the joke rests *in dicto* or *in re*. "Express the same meaning in other words," he says, "and notice whether it still seems funny." Poor Lord Dundreary, who expected to amuse his audience by giving as an answer to the question, "When is a door not a door?" the reply, "When it is partly open," should have had his attention called to this distinction. The *in dicto* jokes, according to Cicero, may arise in two ways—either from the use of an ambiguous word or from the ambiguous use of a word. Another story quoted by Cicero illustrates the latter. A sacred statue had been mutilated one night and a young man, Titius by name, was strongly suspected. Now he was an inveterate ball player, and his companions, when they had gathered the next day as usual at the field, marveled at his non-appearance. "Oh," said Vespa Terentius, "he can't come—he has broken an arm." Whether it was his own arm or the arm of the statue was left *in ambiguo*. As another means to secure a comic effect Cicero mentions the substitution in a sentence of something entirely unexpected for that which the hearer naturally anticipates. In some cases the surprise itself is sufficient to raise a laugh—but when the unexpected portion is witty *per se*, the effect is more striking. As a modern example of the first kind we have the story of the school-boy's extemporaneous oration on the Seasons. "We have four seasons," he began, "spring, summer, autumn, and winter. Some prefer spring, some prefer summer, some prefer autumn, and some prefer winter; but as for me—give me liberty or give me death!" The second kind (i.e., where the unexpected portion is witty in itself) is well illustrated by the famous remark of Franklin to the other signers of the Declaration of Independence—when someone had said "We must all hang together," he added "Yes,

or we shall all hang separately." Cicero gives many illustrations of jokes in which the humorous effect comes from the unexpectedness of a reply. When a certain man said to Crassus, "Shall I disturb you if I come to consult you tomorrow morning before daybreak?" "Not at all," said Crassus. "Then you will give orders that you be called early, I suppose?" "No indeed, for I have just said that I should not be disturbed." According to Quintilian, Gabba happened at one time to be living in a house with a leaky roof. A friend asked for the loan of his raincoat and he answered, "I can't accommodate you, for I'm going to stay at home today."

The house of the bard Theodorus burned down.
 What an insult, O Muses, to you!
 The Gods have done wrong;
 For the credit of song,
 The bard—should have burned with it too.—Martial.

Cicero speaks also of cases where the element of unexpectedness is introduced through the change, first, of a single letter in a repeated word, or second, of a single word in a repeated clause. When a football star before a great game once answered a none-too-sanguine supporter who said: "I suppose you've got to take what comes," with "Yes, unless we make what comes," he was illustrating the former. When someone criticized the old-fashioned diction of Cato in that he had used an unnecessary preposition and asked "What's the need of *t h r o u g h*?" the angry answer was, "What's the need of you?" and thus is illustrated the second. A perverse determination to misinterpret what one hears often produces a humorous effect which again illustrates the *παρὰ προσδοκίαν* joke. The inhabitants of Terracina sent Augustus the wonderful and, as they thought, flattering news that a palm had grown up on his altar. "That shows how often you use it," said he.

A popular lecturer recently divided funny stories into three classes: (1) where the point is stated in words; (2) where the point is illustrated by some accompanying gesture, and (3) where the point must be gained by inference. As an example of the last he told the story of a man who sat fishing on the bank of a stream which ran by the wall of an insane asylum. One of the inmates looked

over the wall and said, "What have you caught?" "Nothing." "How long have you been fishing?" "Four hours." "Come inside," said the man. Several of Cicero's stories admirably illustrate this type of the point by inference. A certain Sicilian when a friend was telling how his wife had hanged herself on a fig tree said, "Won't you please give me some slips from that tree that I may plant them?" A notably bad lawyer who complained of hoarseness on the eve of his defense of a client, was advised to go home and drink a certain mixture of honey and wine. "But," he expostulated, "if I do that I shall ruin my voice!" "Better your voice than your client," was the heartless answer. Compare this with the following from the *Fliegende Blaetter*: "I certainly am sincerely indebted to you for winning my case." "By no means. I represented your opponent." "Just so." Caius Caesar said to Pomponius who displayed a wound which he had received in his mouth during the rebellion of Sulpicius and which he boasted he had received fighting for Caesar, "You shouldn't look back when you're running." Incongruity, surprise, exaggeration, and irreverence are the four qualities mentioned by Professor Phelps in discussing Mark Twain's humor. The essence, he says, is incongruity, and the others follow in their order. We have already noticed incongruity and surprise as common elements used by the Romans to produce a humorous effect. Irreverence appears in the treatment of Tiresias by Horace, in the epigrams addressed by Martial to various prominent persons, and elsewhere. Juvenal's "irreverent freedom of expression" is one element which has caused certain editors "to compare him with James Russell Lowell in the *Biglow Papers* and to describe his rather grim wit as 'the earliest known instance of American humor.'" Exaggeration too undoubtedly does as good service for Juvenal, for instance, when he is enumerating the various noises at night which render sleep impossible at Rome, as it ever did for Mark Twain. Mr. Howsanlott's guests in our Sunday supplements have no more harrowing experiences than he describes.

In short, analyses of American humor seem to apply very well to what is left of Roman humor; analyses of Roman humor can be completely illustrated from our own stories, and much of the

humorous literature of the two peoples is found to be identical, both in type and subject-matter. In addition to what has previously been mentioned, one might add this further enumeration of detail. Puns, sarcasm and irony, practical jokes, picturesque slang, and humorous situations arising from misunderstandings, self-conceit, mistaken identity, gullibility, intoxication, Christmas presents passed on, guests who outstay their welcome, men who are afraid of their wives, extravagant sons and angry fathers—all these amused the Romans long ago. Even the mother-in-law did not escape Juvenal. The temptation is strong to claim a prototype in Roman humor for every subject upon which our wits exercise their ingenuity. Yet a rather desultory investigation has happened upon no instances of the humorous treatment of hypocrisy in religion as we have in many "deacon" stories. Very conspicuous also by their absence are the numerous developments of the child motif. Is it possible that the *enfant terrible* never appeared in Roman costume?

THE PROSECUTION OF ARCHIAS

BY RICHARD WELLINGTON HUSBAND
Dartmouth College

The oration delivered by Cicero in behalf of his friend Archias in the year following his consulship is justly celebrated chiefly, if not solely, on account of its glowing praise of literature. The argument on the legal points at issue occupies only about one-third of the whole speech. It is usually said that Cicero won his case so easily, and with so few words, that he seized the opportunity to devote the remainder of his time to discussing a theme that was always close to his heart. Doubtless owing to the great intrinsic interest of this portion of the speech, the fact that it was delivered in a court of law, and has a distinct legal aspect, is commonly neglected. And yet the case is an interesting one in several particulars from the legal point of view.

The facts of the life of Archias are given briefly by Cicero, so far as they relate to the legal questions involved. Archias was born of noble family about 120 B.C. in the Syrian city of Antioch. His name shows that he was of Greek parentage. In his own city he received a good education, for Antioch was an educational center as well as a noted commercial emporium. While a mere youth he traveled in Asia Minor and Greece, winning reputation as a scholar. Soon thereafter he made his way still farther west, and visited many of the Greek cities of southern Italy. Here, Cicero tells us, he was held in so high esteem that four cities presented him with their local citizenship. Of these four cities Tarentum was at that time a favored Roman colony, while Locri, Neapolis, and Rhegium were probably federated cities. The acquisition of citizenship in these cities would involve for him the acquisition of all the rights possessed by the residents of the cities, such as those of holding property and transacting business, of voting for local magistrates and senators, and of holding office in the cities. It would also grant him the right of holding property in Rome and of doing business there. Citizenship in the federated

cities, which was the limited form of citizenship called by the Romans *civitas Latina*, would not allow him, except under special conditions, to vote or hold office in Rome. But if he were a full citizen of a Roman colony, such as Tarentum, he would have all the rights denied to the citizens of federated cities. In the Roman colonies, however, only a small percentage of the inhabitants was composed of Romans with full *civitas Romana*, while the great majority, that is to say the original inhabitants of the cities, possessed fewer rights than did the Romans who had been sent out from Rome to form colonies there. It is incredible that a naturalized foreigner, as was Archias, should have received the full Roman citizenship in a Roman colony. In fact, it is very doubtful whether any authority less than that of the Roman people itself would suffice to make a grant of such extensive privileges. Had this grant been made to Archias he would henceforth have been a full Roman citizen, and no suit could ever have been entered against him for usurping civic rights.

In the consulship of Marius and Catulus, 102 B.C., he went to Rome, evidently with the intention of settling there. He became associated on terms of intimacy with some of the most influential families of the city, notably with the Luculli. When Marcus Lucullus went to Sicily as proconsul he was accompanied by Archias. Upon their return to Italy they stopped at Heraclea, a federated city, where Archias was granted the citizenship, while Lucullus was present at the ceremony and stood sponsor for him. Apparently, however, he did not remain long at Heraclea, but went again to Rome, without the loss of his citizenship at Heraclea. After the Social War Archias profited by one of the wisest laws ever enacted by a Roman assembly. This was the *lex Plautia-Papiria*, proposed and carried in 89 B.C. by two tribunes, M. Plautius Silvanus and C. Papirius Carbo. Cicero recites in full the provisions of this law, so far as they affected Archias, namely, that any citizen of a federated town should receive the full rights of Roman citizenship provided he registered his name with a praetor at Rome within sixty days after the enactment of the law. The grant of citizenship was supposed by the Roman constitution to be an act of the whole people, but this measure was passed by the plebeian assembly, and

accepted as law by the nation. It affords another interesting example of the constantly increasing seizure of the management of affairs by the common people. The law of Silvanus and Carbo was the beginning of the rapid extension of the franchise, completed by Caracalla, which tended to make the Roman Empire a unit.

It would be impossible to tell how many were affected by this law, but undoubtedly there were thousands of residents of Rome who had possessed Latin citizenship and were now eager to obtain the fuller privileges of Roman citizenship. Probably many came also from neighboring or distant towns to register. They would crave not so much to influence legislation by their votes, or to acquire the right to hold office, as to gain better facilities for conducting their business, and fuller access to the courts of law where they would be heard more equitably. In case they engaged in foreign trade or traveled abroad they would find their Roman citizenship of greater value than their former Latin citizenship. Archias complied with the terms specified, and was enrolled in the lists of his friend the praetor Q. Metellus. Twice thereafter he was absent from Rome, both times with L. Lucullus, the son of his former chief and friend in Sicily. He was in Asia with Lucullus in the campaigns conducted in 74 and the years following, and later in the war against the pirates of the Mediterranean, before Lucullus was superseded by Pompey.

In the year 65 the *lex Papia* was passed, according to which one who had used the rights of *civitas Romana* without legal qualification might be prosecuted. It contained also a clause which was probably impossible to enforce, to the effect that all foreigners in Rome who did not have residence in Italy should be expelled. The law was evidently intended to maintain the dignity of the Roman franchise and to prevent a recurrence of the possibility of packing the assemblies with Latin-speaking foreigners. Three somewhat similar laws had been passed earlier. The *lex Claudia* of 177 had enacted that Latins should be expelled from the city. The *lex Iunia* of 126 had involved the expulsion of all foreigners. The third law of this kind, the *lex Licinia-Mucia* of 95, was much less drastic. It forbade *peregrini* from exercising the functions of citizens, and appointed a special commission to prosecute those who had usurped

the rights of citizenship, and send them back to their own communities. Mild and reasonable as it might seem, this law was one of the immediate causes of the Social War. The innovation contained in the *lex Papia* was that it arranged for conducting prosecutions systematically. In the event of conviction there was apparently no penalty prescribed, but the person convicted was simply thereafter excluded from participation in the privileges of citizenship. This seems to be the logical conclusion from the words of Cicero in the case of Balbus, the only other case of the kind where we have full particulars. There Cicero says only that the civil status of Balbus was threatened. Once or twice he speaks of the punishment of Balbus, but in such a way as to leave the impression that the punishment consisted simply in the loss of the privileges he had formerly enjoyed. There is no indication that Balbus would suffer in any other manner if convicted.

Under the *lex Papia*, action was brought against Archias by one Grattius, who is otherwise unknown. It is supposed that he was the tool of a faction opposed to the Luculli, and that through him they attempted to annoy the Luculli by bringing action against one in whom this family was interested. The trial of Balbus, presumably of the same form as that of Archias, is called a *iudicium publicum*, which should be synonymous with *quaestio perpetua*. But we know of no law establishing such a *quaestio*, unless it was done by the *lex Papia* itself. This would be in accordance with the Roman practice of defining an offense and indicating the mode of treating cases arising from it in the same enactment. The trial of Archias is also called a *iudicium publicum* and was conducted before a praetor and *iudices*. The only known form of trial in which these were both present is the *quaestio perpetua*. It seems necessary, therefore, to add a *quaestio de civitate* to the list of *quaestiones perpetuae* already recognized. A scholiast has given us the pleasant information that in this trial Quintus Cicero was the praetor before whom his more illustrious brother, Marcus, made the principal speech for the defense.

Grattius endeavored to establish four points against Archias:

1. That Archias was not a citizen of Heraclea, and could produce no official documents in support of his claim to citizenship there.

2. That he had not legal residence in Rome.
3. That he had not made his declaration before a praetor, but that his name had been inserted fraudulently in the praetor's list.
4. That he was not recognized as a citizen, inasmuch as his name did not appear in the censors' lists.

Cicero meets these four points in order in the following way:

1. That Archias was not a citizen of Heraclea:

a) His name had appeared in the records of the city, but these could not be produced inasmuch as they had been burned in the course of the Social War. Rome required all federated states to keep a list of their available military strength, and of those whose property might be assessed. Such are the lists which Livy refers to as *formulae*. From these *formulae* Rome made up her auxiliary land forces, and levied them upon declaration of need by the senate and consuls. If Archias, or any other citizen of an allied town, proved his claim to Roman citizenship he would be relieved from the possibility of being obliged to serve in these land forces. It is interesting to note that the records of Heraclea were burned prior to the enactment of the *lex Plautia-Papiria*, and that if this point were pressed and acknowledged no citizen of Heraclea could acquire *civitas Romana*.

b) M. Lucullus, being summoned as a witness, swore that he had been present when Archias received the citizenship at Heraclea, and had acted as his sponsor on that occasion. We have no means of knowing what the ceremony of naturalization was, or what part Lucullus played in it, but his evidence as a participator in the ceremony would be very strong.

c) Envoys from Heraclea were present at the trial with *mandata* and *publicum testimonium*. The *mandata* were oral instructions from the senate of the city, directing the envoys, called *legati*, as to what facts they should state by way of evidence at the trial. The *publicum testimonium* was the official declaration of the senate, submitted in writing, to be presented by the envoys simply as an official document bearing the authority of the city.

d) Archias was confident that the evidence of his citizenship at Heraclea would be accepted, and therefore made no attempt to establish the fact of his citizenship in other cities. This argument

would, of course, not add to the strength of his claims, but it might have its moral effect upon a jury, whether ancient or modern. The supposition is that he could prove his Latin citizenship in Tarentum, or in Naples, or in one of the other cities. Since, however, he had registered as from Heraclea it would be of no avail twenty-five years later to set up a different claim. But Cicero skilfully utilizes the point to impress the jury.

2. That Archias had not legal residence in Rome: Cicero says that Archias held property in Rome, and that all his business for many years had been transacted there. The evidence offered by the defense supplied proof that in his business relations Archias was recognized as possessing *ius commercii*, characteristic of *civitas Latina*, if not of *civitas Romana*. Otherwise he could not have been a property holder in Rome.

3. That Archias did not make his declaration before a praetor: But his name was found in the records of Metellus, and as these records were strictly honest the claim that the name of Archias was entered fraudulently is groundless. Cicero recites the incident of Metellus going before the praetor Lentulus and *iudices* with the complaint that a name had been erased from his list. This would mean that he was prosecuting some person for having tampered with his books. His strictness contrasts strongly with the negligence of Appius and with the still worse faults of Gabinius.

4. The name of Archias did not appear in the censors' lists:

a) In the censorship of Julius and Crassus, the first censors after the enactment of the *lex Plautia-Papiria*, the census was not taken. This is another indication of the ineffectiveness of the office of the censors in the last century of the Republic.

b) At the time of the next censors he was with L. Lucullus in Asia, and therefore could not be enrolled.

c) At the time of the last censors he was with Lucullus in the army.

These points naturally end the argument for the defense, but before Cicero rested his case he added a few other facts. These new facts merely serve the purpose of showing that Archias had used the rights of citizenship unchallenged, or better, that his claims to citizenship had been recognized by the officials in Rome.

Perhaps Cicero means to imply that these officials had investigated the facts, and had been convinced of the validity of his claim.

The points raised are three:

1. He had made wills according to *nostrae leges*, that is, according to the *ius civile*.

2. He had received inheritances, or legacies, from Roman citizens. These two points satisfactorily prove the same thing, namely, that Archias was not a *peregrinus*. No foreigner had the legal right to make a will in Rome according to the Roman forms and have it accepted as valid. The more formal method of making a will necessitated the presence of a Roman citizen to superintend the ceremony, and also the presence of at least five witnesses who were Roman citizens. By a less ceremonious method a will was valid only if attested by the seals of seven citizens who witnessed the signature of the testator. And Gaius tells in the second book of the *Institutes* that inheritances and legacies could not be received by foreigners or Latins, for these means of acquiring property were available only to those who had the right to make wills, that is, to citizens.

3. He had been presented by Lucullus at the treasury to receive rewards for services. These services were probably rendered in the army, but we cannot tell what they were. Nor is the significance of the whole matter by any means clear. The natural inference is that only a citizen could be so honored, but on this point we have no information.

Notes

[Contributions in the form of notes or discussions should be sent to John A. Scott, Northwestern University, Evanston, Ill.]

THE STORM-TOSSED TRANSPORTS: A REPLY

In the *Classical Journal* of 1911 (pp. 76-79) Mr. Alfred R. Wightman discussed the passage (*B.G.*, iv. 28, §§ 2-3) in which Caesar describes what befell his cavalry transports, and incidentally criticized my explanation. I was unable to read his article until a few weeks ago.

Commenting on the interpretation of *tamen*—"notwithstanding" (the gale)—which I have given, in common with Kraner-Dittenberger and other editors, Mr. Wightman says that "the sailors . . . cast anchor . . . not because the desirability of remaining off the coast of Britain was just then uppermost in their minds, but because they were under the instant need of . . . avoiding shipwreck." I maintain, on the contrary, that they cast anchor because they purposed to remain in a position from which they might be able, when the gale ceased, to reach their destination—the coast of Britain, near Caesar's camp. But, says Mr. Wightman, "if the storm was so violent that the transports were falling to leeward in spite of all efforts to hold them on their course [what efforts? Caesar does not mention any], one might naturally expect that when rounded up and swung head to at anchor they would pitch so heavily as to put their bows under." No doubt they did pitch heavily; and no doubt this explains why, as Caesar says (though Mr. Wightman argues that he does not), they "were becoming water-logged" (*fluctibus complerentur*).

Mr. Wightman then proceeds to deal with me. On p. 319 of *Ancient Britain* I wrote, "The ships which were swept down past the Foreland and the Dover cliffs scudded before the northeasterly gale; and although they were evidently in no danger of being driven ashore, they were in great peril because only the most watchful steering could prevent them from broaching to: if a heavy sea struck the stern, it might swing the vessel round, and in a moment she would overset and founder. The ships which were carried back to the point from which they had started were of course handled differently," etc. Again, on p. 582, speaking of the transports that ran before the wind, I wrote, "They were in no danger of being driven ashore; for while the gale was at its height they stood out to sea." Referring to the latter passage, Mr. Wightman says, "This reasoning seems to me inconsequent. When Caesar says the ships were being carried out of their course, all we are to understand therefrom is that they were falling rapidly to leeward; and as he plainly tells us land was under their lee bow, the danger to which he refers is obviously that of striking.

To avert this it was necessary to tack ship and stand off shore. But the fact that they did this while the gale was still at its height does not warrant the assumption that they were in no danger of being driven ashore when on the other tack standing westward."

The radical error in this criticism lies in the words "as he plainly tells us land was under their lee bow, the danger to which he refers is obviously that of striking." Caesar does not tell us that "land was under their lee bow." What he does tell us is that "they were getting close to Britain and were seen from the camp, when such a violent storm suddenly arose that none of them could keep their course, but some were carried back to the point from which they had started, while others were swept down in great peril [I will justify this translation presently] toward the lower and more westerly part of the island" (*quae cum adpropinquarent Britanniae et ex castris viderentur, tanta tempestas subito coorta est ut nulla earum cursum tenere posset, sed aliae eodem unde erant profectae referrentur, aliae ad inferiorem partem insulae, quae est propius solis occasum, magno suo cum periculo deicerentur*). The camp, as I have shown in *Ancient Britain*, was at Walmer. This conclusion has been generally accepted; and Mr. Wightman does not gainsay it. Indeed, unless the camp was somewhere in East Kent, no lee shore can by any ingenuity be discovered; and supposing that when the storm arose the transports were a little south of the latitude of Walmer—say somewhere near the point where the South Sand Head Light Vessel is now moored—they were obviously in no danger of being driven ashore by a northeasterly gale: they would have been driven through the Dover Strait into the Channel. Will Mr. Wightman say what was the land "under their lee bow" on which they were in danger of striking? If he does not know the British coast, let him consult a map, and he will see that the only lee shore to which he can point is the shore of East Kent. But this is out of the question, not only for the reason which I have just given, but also for others: first, the ships had been making for East Kent, but when the storm arose they could not keep their course; secondly, the ships with which we are concerned were swept down toward "the lower and more westerly part of the island." When they were running in what was, as Mr. Wightman himself says, a "southwesterly direction" and before what he rightly calls "a northeaster," they were evidently in no danger of striking either the British coast or the Gallic coast; and the nearest lee shore was the shore of America, or, possibly, of the Bermudas. Mr. Wightman insists that "*deici* applied to ships refers not to their scudding before a gale with plenty of sea-room . . . but to their being swept down upon some danger point to leeward." It may refer to either: anyhow in this case the "danger point" was 3,000 miles or more away.

"One should not fail," says Mr. Wightman, "to observe his [Rice Holmes's] peculiar rendering of the phrase *magno sui* [or rather *suo*] *cum periculo*, 'in great peril.' Now *cum* in such phrases is regularly rendered by 'at' or 'to.' The latter fits here; i.e., it was the rapid drift of the transports in this south-

westerly direction that was fraught with danger. To translate this phrase 'in great peril' looks like a twist of *cum* for the sake of making Caesar's words square with a preconceived notion on the part of the translator." I would ask Mr. Wightman what is the essential difference between "in great peril" and "at [or "to"] great peril"? Were the Roman traders not *in* danger when they crossed the Alps *magno cum periculo* (iii. 1, § 2)? Or Quintus Cicero's troops when they were defending their camp (v. 52, § 37)? Does Mr. Wightman mean that the ships were not in peril?¹ He cannot mean this; for he says himself that it was their "rapid drift . . . that was fraught with danger," that "the danger to which he [Caesar] refers is obviously that of striking," and that we must not assume "that they were in no danger of being driven ashore." If they were "*in* danger of being driven ashore," why does Mr. Wightman find fault with my translation of *magno cum periculo*? And why did their captains fatuously incur this danger, when all that they had to do, in order to avoid it, was *immediately* to follow the example of the other group of transports—"tack ship and stand off shore"?

"Yet," continues Mr. Wightman, "aside from all this, Mr. Holmes's theory breaks down on internal evidence. If two methods of procedure were open to the Gallic sailors—either to run before the wind or lie to—why, I ask, after pursuing the former method for a time, did they subsequently anchor?" Evidently, I reply, because they did not want to be driven into the Atlantic and did want to land the cavalry. "If," Mr. Wightman continues, "there was plenty of sea-room . . . no real sailor, having once started to run before the wind, would ever think of casting anchor except he had got into some sheltered position." Precisely what these Gallic sailors had done; that is to say, they had got into a *comparatively* sheltered position. There are several points off the southern coast of Kent where, owing to the high ground, the force of a northeasterly gale would have been in some measure broken, though, as it turned out, the shelter was not enough. But, Mr. Wightman insists, to anchor "was a blunder, and blunder number two if the vessels had really been running before the wind, for by so doing the shipmasters had not only wasted time and effort, but had put themselves in a position which, as regards laying their course back to the continent, was much worse than that they occupied when it came on to blow. They were now forced to close-haul from a point just so much farther dead to leeward. Compared with their fellows in the other group of transports, what a mess they had made of it—according to Mr. Holmes."

Yes, and what is more important, according to Caesar. Certainly to anchor was a blunder, in the sense that it was an attempt which failed—a blunder which the "shipmasters" committed because they clung to the hope of being able to achieve the object of their voyage by landing the cavalry, which Caesar was anxiously awaiting. How much farther to leeward they

¹ Of course in certain passages, e.g., iii. 1, § 2, *magno cum periculo* might advantageously be translated, *with no essential difference of meaning*, by "at great risk."

were when they began "to close-haul" we do not know—perhaps not more than a few miles; and since they got safely back to the continent, what did it matter? But what is truly amazing is that Mr. Wightman fails to see that if, as he maintains, they did not commit this "blunder" and if, as he implies, "the vessels" had not "really been running before the wind," they acted in exactly the same way as "the other group of transports," whereas it is clear from Caesar's narrative that they acted quite differently. The only way of escape open to Mr. Wightman is to suppose that the "shipmasters," with their eyes open, allowed their ships to drift helplessly toward "some danger point to leeward," but at last, when the danger of striking became imminent, woke up and put them on the other tack! Let us see how Mr. Wightman absolves them from the charge of having "made a mess of it." "I venture," he says, "to suggest that anchors were not thrown out at all; that the ablative absolute [*ancoris iactis*] here puts a hypothetical case merely; that *tamen* sets over against their [the seamen's] present peril the danger involved in casting anchor . . . that the subjunctive *complerentur* is one of Ideal Certainty, being future to a past tense. . . . Accordingly I should render 'And though they were to cast anchor, still, since in that case they would fill, these latter, as their only resource, standing to sea even in the face of night, headed for the continent.'"

Can the reader follow Mr. Wightman's argument? He asserts that the transports "had been caught by a gale . . . on a lee shore. What," he asks, "was to be done? Two courses of action were open—to cast anchor, or to put to sea." Mr. Wightman says that they did not cast anchor: therefore he evidently means that they put to sea. Certainly they put to sea—"in the face of night"; but, whether they anchored or not, before they put to sea, "they were swept down *magno suo cum periculo* toward the lower and more westerly part of the island." Evidently, then, when they stood out to sea "in the face of night" they *were* "forced to close-haul from a point just so much farther dead to leeward," and the shipmasters *had* "put themselves in a position which, as regards laying their course back to the continent, was much worse than that they occupied when it came on to blow." But, I repeat, since they were swept toward "the lower and more westerly part of the island"—in other words, down the Channel—there was no "danger point to leeward" within 3,000 miles. What, then, was this "danger point to leeward"? What was the "lee shore"? We have seen that, if it existed at all, it could only have been East Kent. But Mr. Wightman will hardly maintain that East Kent was "the more westerly part of the island" or that the shipmasters would have been mad enough to let the ships drift toward East Kent, even for one minute. If the wind had blown them toward that "danger point," they would immediately have acted like their comrades of "the other group" and made for the continent.

T. RICE HOLMES

11 DOURO PLACE, KENSINGTON, W.
LONDON, ENGLAND

CAES. B.G. I. 3

a senatu populi Romani amicus appellatus erat.

Upon what does the genitive *populi Romani* depend, *senatu* or *amicus*? Not a large question, to be sure, and for that reason ignored by most editors. Bennett takes it with *senatu*; so also Meusel. I prefer to take it with *amicus*. My reasons are as follows:

1. The *senatus* without a qualifying genitive is pre-eminently the Roman senate; cf. *B.G.* i. 33 and 43, where no such genitives are found, even though the association of other peoples who had senates might have caused confusion, as in the case of the Aeduans whose senate is mentioned in i. 31; vii. 32, 33. True, the possessive *nostro* is twice used with *senatus* (iv. 12; vii. 31), but it is not open to the same objections as the genitive of the proper noun (see under 3). Nor does Caesar with any other people use *senatus* with the genitive of the proper noun, though *quorum* is found in iv. 11. Cicero has no use of *senatus* with the genitive of *populus Romanus*, but in *Cat.* iii. 11 the genitive *Allobrogium* is found but with the correlative *senatum* and *populum*.

2. In our passage the genitive goes well with *amicus* because *amicitia* as a relation of the Roman people as a whole toward certain foreigners is the normal thing; cf. *B.G.* i. 31, 40, 43, 44 (twice); iv. 16; v. 3; vii. 39; and with the concrete *amicus*, i. 33, 35; cf. i. 33 with *Tac. Ann.* xi. 25, whereby it appears that the relationship pronounced by the senate pertains to the whole people. Cf. also Cic. *in Verrem* iv. 18, 68; *pro M. Fonteio* 32 (associated with *socius* in all cases). This relationship of the *amicus* to the Roman people is quite generally recognized by modern editors; cf. Phillipson, *International Law and Custom of Ancient Greece and Rome*, I, 223; Muirhead, *Roman Law*, p. 106; Sihler, *Annals of Caesar*, p. 90 (Ariovistus, the friend of the Roman people); Holmes, *Caesar's Conquest of Gaul*, p. 40 (Ariovistus, the friend of the Roman people).

3. The normal relation between the senate and the Roman people is a correlative one, as is illustrated by the frequently appearing *senatus populusque Romanus*. The mutual exclusion suggested by this phrase renders it difficult in our passage to construe *populi* with *senatus*. With a possessive as *noster* (see above) there would not be the same content; it would be broader and more indefinite. Such a combination is found in neither Caesar nor Cicero, unless here. Caesar uses the S.P.Q.R. phrase in *B.C.* i. 9; cf. also iii. 10, where once with *et* and again with usual order reversed.

If the genitive here depends upon *senatus* it would be analogous to saying in English, "the House of the Senate." It may be said that there was a broader use of *populus Romanus*, and that in this use it may be construed with *senatus*. See Just. *Inst.* i. 2, 4: "plebs autem a populo eo differt, quo species a genere: nam appellatione populi universi cives significantur, connumeratis etiam patriciis et senatoribus." But note that the senators are referred to as individuals and not as a body. With this compare Cic. *in Ver.* v. 171: "cum

loquar apud senatores populi Romani." He seems to have chosen the word *senatores* rather than *senatum* in order to avoid collision with the suggestions carried by the common S.P.Q.R. phrase.

For these reasons I feel that it is more probable that Caesar intended the genitive to limit *amicus*.

ARTHUR L. KEITH

CARLETON COLLEGE
NORTHFIELD, MINN.

JUVENAL I. III: *pedibus albis*

Exspectent ergo tribuni,
vincant divitiae, sacro ne cedat honori
nuper in hanc urbem *pedibus qui venerat albis*,
quandoquidem inter nos sanctissima divitiarum
maiestas.

110

The ancient scholiast (Codex Pithoeanus) completely missed the point of I. III, for he took *pedibus albis* to mean "dressed in white trousers or shoes" and to refer to some rich foreigner newly come to the city who by his immaculate footwear acquired more obsequious attention than the tribune could by virtue of his sacrosanctity. The so-called Scholia Cornuti, which are late and inaccurate, explain *albis* as *de pulvere terrae*, "one who came a dusty tramp and is so soon grown opulent."

Modern commentators all take the line to mean "one who recently had come to Rome as a slave." We are justified, I think (even without emending to *venerit*), in translating as a concessive clause: "Let him (the rich freedman from the Euphrates), though he came but lately to the city with his feet whitened, not step aside for the sacred magistrate, since among us the most sacred authority of all is that of riches."

There has been considerable diversity and vagueness in explaining the whitened feet. Mayor simply cites parallel passages. Macleane says, "Slaves newly imported are generally said to have been chalked on the soles of their feet when exposed for sale; . . . but what could have been the use of chalk ng their soles is not obvious to me. They may have worn white slippers, perhaps, or something of that sort." Others note that whitened feet designate the "newly imported" slave, or one "brought from beyond the seas." The note by Lewis, "The origin is probably due to the custom of marking the feet of a slave so that he could be traced, as has been pointed out by Mr. Simcox," states the truth in part, I

believe, and naturally raises the query, "What kind of marking was it and what traces did it make possible?" Farnabius (1648), conjecturing from the use of clay (*creta*) in sealing documents, wrote:

Servi e transmarinis evecti venales prostituebantur cretatis gypsatisque pedibus, signato sigillo domini, si privati essent, reipublicae, si publica mancipia.

There are four passages that relate to the practice:

Tibull. ii. 3, 59:

Nota loquor; regnum iste tenet quem saepe coegit
barbara gypsatos ferre catasta pedes.

A slave has been repeatedly exposed for sale on the auctioneer's staging with his feet coated with gypsum.

Propert. v=iv. 5, 51:

aut quorum titulus per barbara colla pendit
cretati (*sic Passerat. caelati codd.*) medio dum saluere foro.

The slaves are foreigners, and wear both the chalk coating over their feet and, on their necks, the *titulus* (cf. Gellius iv. 2) that described their capabilities and defects. Any number or mark for the purpose of identifying an individual slave would presumably have been inscribed plainly upon the *titulus*.

Ovid *Amor.* i. 8, 63:

Nec tu si quis erit capitis mercede redemptus
despice gypsati crimen inane pedis.

The reproach of whitened feet is applied to the slave newly purchased; his foreign origin is not stated. *Gypsati* and *cretati* denote a comparatively permanent coating of fine plaster, not mere crayon marks; we cannot accept the suggestion that the custom had its origin in a device to track a fugitive by his white footprints.

Plin. *N.H.* xxxv. 199: Alia creta argentaria appellatur, nitorem argento reddens. Set vilissima qua circum praeducere ad victoriae notam [the calx, goal line] pedesque venalium trans maria advectorum denotare instituerunt maiores. . . . talem in catasta videre Chrysogonum Sullae . . . aliosque deinceps, quos enumerare iam non est, sanguine Quiritium et proscriptionum licentia ditatos. Hoc est insigne venaliciis gregibus, opprobriumque insolentis fortunae. Quos et nos adeo potiri rerum vidimus ut praetoria quoque ornamenta decerni a senatu iubente Agrippina Claudii Caesaris videremus, tantumque non cum laureatis fascibus remitti illo unde cretatis pedibus advenissent.

It is not distinctly stated that the whitened feet are a mark to distinguish imported slaves from those bred in Italy (as the *corona* marked the war-captive, and the *pilleus* marked a rogue to be sold without guaranty), and indeed since the vast majority of slaves were of foreign origin and showed it by racial characteristics, it is hard to see the use of any mark for that purpose. But the whitened feet are a sign, we are told, that the slaves *are for sale* ("Hoc est insigne venaliciis gregibus"; "pedes venalium, trans mare advectorum, denotare")—that they are then unemployed and are being shipped by a dealer. The slave bore this mark on the journey from his native land ("unde cretatis pedibus advenissent") and when he arrived at Rome ("in hanc urbem pedibus qui venerat albis").

In regard to the purpose of the practice, I suppose that the white coating of the feet served as an inexpensive substitute for our prison stripes, to enable the dealer to recognize at a glance those belonging to his gang, to facilitate the immediate recapture of any slave who broke away while being transported, and also to denote that the slave was for sale and attract the attention of prospective purchasers.

G. B. COLBURN

UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI

Book Reviews

Cäsars Feldzüge in Gallien und Britannien. Von T. RICE HOLMES.
Uebersetzung und Bearbeitung von WILHELM SCHOTT und
FELIX ROSENBERG. Leipzig: Teubner, 1913. Pp. 14+299;
3 maps. M. 9.

Mr. Holmes's two masterly works, *Caesar's Conquest of Gaul* (Oxford, 1911²), and *Ancient Britain and the Invasions of Julius Caesar* (Oxford, 1907), are now too well known to need commendation. The favorable reception given them in Germany prompted the late Wilhelm Schott to bring them to the acquaintance of a wider circle of readers by translation and condensation. The two large volumes of the original are here reduced into the limits of a single book of moderate size. The narrative portions are welded together and reproduced entire, or substantially so; the critical and argumentative portions are much condensed, being confined to footnotes and a few appendices. After the death of Mr. Schott, Mr. Rosenberg completed the work on the original translator's plan, revised it throughout, and saw it through the press. The rendering appears to be excellently done, and although the advanced student of Caesar's commentaries can ill afford to disregard any of Mr. Holmes's argument, he cannot reasonably find fault with the judicious manner in which the selection and condensation has been carried out. Indeed, I am not sure that a similar abbreviation in English would not be worth while. The two volumes of the original are somewhat formidable to the young student, and they are undeniably expensive, even for some school libraries.

E. T. M.

W. S. Teuffels Geschichte der römischen Literatur. Sechste Auflage,
neu bearbeitet von WILHELM KROLL und FRANZ SKUTSCH.
Dritter Band, "Die Literatur von 96 nach Chr. bis zum
Ausgange des Altertums." Leipzig: Teubner, 1913. Pp. 8+
579. M. 10.

The second volume of this sixth edition of Teuffel was the first to appear (in 1910), and was duly noticed in the *Journal* at the time (VI, 222 f.). Three years is a long time to wait between volumes of a work like this, but criticism is in some measure disarmed by the plea of the surviving editor that the illness and death of his colleague, Skutsch, has occasioned delay, as part of his destined work on the poets had to be done by others. It is more doubtful whether this unhappy event is sufficient excuse for not bringing the bibliographical references in the earlier part of the volume down to date. The latter part is much more satisfactory; and what has been said before concerning the general

value of the work applies to this third volume also. For the first volume we are still waiting. A somewhat vague assurance by the editor gives reason to hope that the intermission will not be long. The publication of the three volumes at widely separated intervals, and the first volume last of all, gives rise to another inconvenience, especially vexatious in a book so widely used for frequent reference. The volumes are indexed separately, and not even in the third volume can the reader find an index to the entire work.

E. T. M.

Roads from Rome. By ANNE C. E. ALLINSON. New York: Macmillan, 1913. Pp. ix+215. \$1.25.

One gets into this book with surprise and delight. Its noncommittal name gives no hint of its contents. It might be a treatise on the ancient art of road-making, or a guide for the convenience of the modern traveler in the neighborhood of Rome. But we are speedily disabused of such ideas, when we find the book a commingling of history and imagination, fact and fancy, all concerned with idealized scenes in the lives of certain of our well-known Roman friends. We have chapters on Catullus, "The Estranger"; on Propertius, "A Poet's Toll"; on Horace, "The Phrase-Maker"; on Ovid, "A Roman Citizen"; on the younger Pliny, "Fortune's Ledger," and on Julius Paulus, himself almost an imaginary character, "A Road to Rome." We may say in passing that three of these chapters had already appeared in *The Atlantic Monthly*.

While these are idealized scenes, they are not the product of mere imagination, for Mrs. Allinson shows a deep, wide, and appreciative knowledge of the characters of which she writes and of their works. She says of her own work: "In all the sketches the essential facts are drawn directly from the writings of the men who appear in them"; and the work teems with familiar scenes, incidents, and sentiments which we easily recognize and justify from the originals themselves. Mrs. Allinson, however, does not insult us by warning signs in the shape of quotation marks, nor (crowning insult!) by footnote references to chapter and verse of each allusion.

In a book abounding in vividly pictured scenes from nature, realistic descriptions of home life, intimate views of the thoughts and fancies of the characters portrayed, perhaps no one passage will better show the author's appreciation of her Roman poets than the letter which Vergil is made to write to the young Propertius in an endeavor to win the latter from an unworthy to a nobler love. The letter echoes and re-echoes with the thoughts and words of the real Vergil. Beginning with exquisite sympathy, the older poet first congratulates his young friend upon his recently published volume of verse, and finds cause for gratitude because Propertius has idealism enough to prefer love to all the riches of the world. But there is love and love.

. . . . Will you let a man who has lived nearly a quarter of a century longer than you have add that I wondered also whether before long you would not seek another

mistress for your worship, one whose service shall transcend not only riches but all personal passions?

Like you I have lain by the Tiber, and watched the skiffs hurrying by, and the slow barges towed along the yellow waves. And my thoughts also have been of the meanness of wealth and of the glory of love. But it was to Rome herself that I made my vows, and in whose service I enlisted. Was there ever a time when she needed more the loyalty of us all? While she is fashioning this Empire which shall be without limit and raise us to the lordship of the earth, she runs the risks of attack from impalpable enemies who shall defile her highways and debauch her sons. Arrogance, luxury, violent ambition, false desires, are more to be dreaded than a Parthian victory. The subtle wickedness of the Orient may conquer us when the spears of Britain are of no avail. Antony and Gallus are not the only Romans from whom Egypt has sucked life and honour. . . .

Our great master, Lucretius, preached salvation through knowledge of the physical world. I have ventured to say that it could be found through the kindly help of the country gods. But now I am beginning to see deeper. In Rome herself lie the seeds of a new birth. When men see her as she is in her ancient greatness and her immortal future, will not greed and lust depart from their hearts? I think it must have been at dawn, when the sea was first reddening under the early sun, that Aeneas sailed up to the mouth of the Tiber, and found at last the heart of that Hesperia whose shores had seemed ever to recede as he drew near them. Now that our sky is blazing with the midday sun, shall we betray and make void those early hopes? Shall the sistrum of Isis drown our prayers to the gods of our country, native-born, who guard the Tiber and our Roman Palatine?

I am seeking to write a poem which shall make men reverence their past and build for their future. Will you not help me to work for Rome's need? You have sincerity, passion, talent. You have commended a beautiful woman to me. Will you not let me commend my mistress to you? Farewell.

Who, after reading this imagined letter, which yet breathes the very spirit of Vergil through and through, will not take up the *Aeneid* again with a new sense of its worth and a new realization of the great patriotic and reverently religious spirit which pervades it?

Mrs. Allinson is to be congratulated and thanked for this valuable and unique contribution to our "helps to classical study."

F. J. MILLER

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

The Elegies of Albius Tibullus; the Corpus Tibullianum. Edited by KIRBY FLOWER SMITH. New York: American Book Co., 1913. \$1.50.

Professor Smith's edition of Tibullus is the fruit of long pondering and careful research. His commentary is not only, as stated in the preface, the first of its scope in English, but the best in any language. It covers Book i and ii, universally accepted as the genuine works of Tibullus, and also the poems of Sulpicia and the anonymous elegies of the fourth book. The text

includes the entire *Corpus Tibullianum*, the ancient *vita*, and a collection of *testimonia antiqua*. While only a brief *apparatus criticus*, in the form of an appendix, is given, critical remarks of great value appear in the notes. The introduction treats, in separate chapters, the development of the elegy, the life of Tibullus, later tradition and imitation, criticism and discussion, the *Corpus Tibullianum*, textual tradition, the poet's art. A concise yet skilfully inclusive index closes the work.

In brief, we have in this volume all necessary information concerning the poet's characteristics, his picture of Roman life and customs, his relation to his predecessors in Greek and Roman elegy, his influence on subsequent poetry. The subject is both minutely and broadly treated. The notes contain the pith of veritable monographs on fine points in Latin grammar and metre, Roman religion and literary history; these discussions not only give a deep insight into the poet's practice, but are valuable contributions to the larger subjects as well. The edition thus has the value of a general source of reference, like Mayor's *Juvenal*, though it avoids the diffuseness from which that great work suffers.

This is not the place for details, but I must cite as a few from many admirable features the editor's discussion of the history of ancient elegy; his sensible attitude toward Jacoby's recent treatment of that subject and toward the passion of various literary critics for analyzing the non-existent; his skilful analysis of the *τόποι* of elegy and of the different poems of Tibullus; his treatment of rhyme in ancient verse, of the dissyllabic law in relation to accent and of the elegiac distich in general; his defense of the genuineness of iv. 13; his comparison of the methods and qualities of Tibullus, Propertius, and Ovid. Above all, he knows his poet and gives him to us here. So profoundly has he penetrated into the inner essence of Tibullus that he finds there a sense of humor. This virtue is not obvious to the casual reader, but if Professor Smith has noted it, it probably exists.

It is a pity that this standard work, in the same class with Monro's *Lucretius*, Ellis's *Catullus*, and Conington's *Virgil*, could not have been published in a more attractive form. Scant margins and drab linen covers suggest a school book, while the demands of the "series" have, apparently, prevented the inclusion of valuable material. If notes on Sulpicia are germane, why none on Lygdamus? Let us hope that before long Professor Smith may give us a second edition in two volumes, one containing introduction, text, and critical apparatus, the other a commentary on the entire *Corpus Tibullianum*.

E. K. RAND

HARVARD UNIVERSITY

Recent Books

Foreign books in this list may be obtained of Lemcke & Buchner, 30-32 West 27th St., New York City; G. E. Stechert & Co., 151-55 West 25th St., New York City.

- ALLCROFT, A. H., AND HAYES, B. J. *Horace's Odes*, II and IV. With introduction, text, and notes. London: Clive. Cr. 8vo, pp. 80. 2s. 6d.
- APPLETON, R. B., AND JONES, W. H. S. *Puer Romanus*. (*Lingua Latina*, edited by W. H. D. ROUSE and S. O. ANDREW.) Oxford: Clarendon Press. Cr. 8vo, pp. 110. 2s. 6d.
- BLAKENEY, E. H. *The Iliad*, books xxi-xxiii. Translated into English Prose. London: Bell. Cr. 8vo, swd. 1s.
- BUTLER, S. *The Humour of Homer and Other Essays*. Edited by A. R. STREATFIELD. London: Fifield. Cr. 8vo, pp. 314. 5s. net.
- COWLES, JULIA D. *Our Little Athenian Cousin of Long Ago*; being the story of Hiero, a boy of Athens. Ill. by J. GOSS. Boston: L. C. Page. Pp. 12+125. \$0.60.
- CROISET, A. *Manual de la littérature grecque*. Paris. Fr. 6.
- HALL, F. W. *A Companion to Classical Texts*. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 8vo, pp. 372. 9s. 6d. net.
- Homer: The Iliad*. Translated into English Prose. Vol. II. Books xiii-xxiv. London: Bell. Cr. 8vo, pp. 428. 3s. 6d.
- JANES, A. L., AND JENKS, P. R. *Bellum Helveticum*; a beginner's book in Latin, with grammatical appendix by A. T. WALKER. Revised edition. Chicago: Scott, Foresman & Co. Pp. 440. \$1.00.
- JEFFCOTT, W. T. *A Dictionary of Classical Names for English Readers*. New York: Macmillan. Cr. 8vo, pp. vi+110. 1s. 6d.
- LOWE, W. D. *Anecdotes from Pliny's Letters*. With introduction, notes, and vocabularies. ("Oxford Elementary Latin Readers.") Oxford: Clarendon Press. 12mo, pp. 96. 1s. 6d.
- MÜLLER, C. F. W. *Cicero's 4. u. 5. Rede gegen Verres*. Textausg. f. den Schulgebrauch. 2. Aufl. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner. 8vo. geb., M. 1. 20.
- MURRAY, GILBERT. *Euripides and His Age*. ("Home University Library.") London: Williams & Norgate. 12mo, pp. 256. 1s. net. leather 2s. 6d. net.
- ROSCHER. *Lexikon der griechischen und römischen Mythologie*. 66 u. 67 Lfg. Leipzig. je M. 2.
- SLOMAN, A. *Elementary Latin Grammar*. Cambridge University Press. Cr. 8vo, pp. 182. 2s. 6d.
- SMITH, C. F. *Thucydides*, book vi. Boston: Ginn & Co. Pp. 250. \$1.50.
- STURTEVANT, E. H. *Studies in Greek Noun Formation*; Labial Terminations, III and IV. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. 8vo, paper, pp. 64. \$0.50 net.
- TAYLOR, H. V. *Synthetic Latin Vocabularies*. Glasgow: Blackie. Cr. 8vo. 1s.
- VOLLMÖLLER, KARL. *Romanische Forschungen*. Organ f. roman. Sprachen. Volks- u. Mittellatein. 34. Bd. 1. Heft. (S. 1-320.) Erlangen: F. Junge. Lex 8vo. M. 12.
- WELLER, C. H. *Athens and Its Monuments*. New York: Macmillan. Pp. 24+412. \$4.00 net.
- WINBOLT, S. E. *Dialogues of Roman Life*. London: Bell. Cr. 8vo. 2s.